

**ICESat-2 Flight Laser
Final RFP Questions and Responses**

1. **QUESTION:** The Final RFP has a schedule in Section B.2 on page 3 that reflects the old draft RFP delivery schedule for flight lasers 1-4 (at ATP +17, +24, +28, +31 months). The SOW, Appendix D, Contract Deliverable Requirements List & Schedule has slipped dates for the laser deliveries of the ITL (ATP + 23 mos.) and Flight Lasers 1-4 (at ATP +18, +26, +30, +35 months). We believe the SOW is the correct (slipped from Draft RFP) schedule. Is the SOW schedule correct?

RESPONSE: The Statement of Work, Appendix D is the correct deliverable schedule. The RFP, Section B, B.2 has been revised to include the delivery of all hardware, including the Integration and Test Laser, and the correct delivery schedule for the Flight Lasers #1-4. The Integration and Test Laser delivery is 23 months after contract award; Flight Laser #1 – 24 months after contract award; Flight Laser #2 - 27 months after contract award; Flight Laser #3 – 30 months after contract award; and Flight Laser #4 - 35 months after contract award.

2. **QUESTION:** RFP states on page 76 that, “The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) contained in the Attachment A Statement of Work, Appendix G of this solicitation shall be used to structure the Mission Suitability Proposal. The Mission Suitability Proposal and the Cost Proposal must follow the provided WBS. ” In section L.14 (a) (5) on page 70-71 the RFP states, “(5) The format for each proposal volume shall parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section M of this solicitation. ” Which statement is correct? We believe it is in the interest of the Government to structure the Mission Suitability Proposal according to section M for ease of evaluation.

RESPONSE: Both instructions apply to the Mission Suitability Proposal. It is correct that the provided WBS structure should be used in structuring the Mission Suitability Proposal in addition to formatting each proposal volume so that they parallel, to the greatest extent possible, the format of the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in Section M.

3. **QUESTION:** Section 5.7.1.1, Vacuum Outgassing of Polymeric Materials (page 37) of the SOW states “Only materials that have a total mass loss (TML) less than 0.25% and a collected volatile condensable mass (CVCM) less than 0.05% shall be approved for use in a vacuum environment.” Contamination Control Plan, section 3.5.1 Outgassing (page 5) states that, “The low outgassing screening criteria of 1% TML and 0.1% CVCM should be used when selecting design options”. Is the Contamination Control plan requirement the one that should be used?

RESPONSE: The SOW takes precedence over the Contamination Control Plan as noted in page 1 of the Statement of Work (ICESat-2-LAS-CTR-0451).

4. **QUESTION:** What RFP G.11 and SOW (Rev. A) Appendix E: Multilayer insulation (MLI) is GFE. Who will be responsible for the MLI integration, government or NGAS?

RESPONSE:

The Multilayer Insulation is Government Furnished Equipment which will be provided to the contractor by the Government. The Government shall install the MLI. The Statement of Work has been revised to reflect the installation of the MLI.

5. **QUESTION:** Period of performance:
- RFP section F.3 states: "The performance incentives cover the on-orbit mission month 6 and conclude 60 months later."
 - Laser performance Spec. section 3.16 Lifetime, Requirement 3.16.1 states: "The laser shall continuously operate on-orbit for a total of 3 years plus 60 days..."

Is it the intent to incentivize a period of performance greater than the specification lifetime requirement?

RESPONSE: The RFP will be updated to state that the performance incentives cover the on-orbit mission month 6 and concludes 36 months later.

6. **QUESTION:** Can the requested Integrated Network schedule be excluded from the Mission Suitability page count? It is advantageous to the Government to be able to evaluate the full detailed proposed program schedule (e.g. 59 E-CDRLs and 51 SMA-CDRLs need to be incorporated into the schedule), and including the program schedule in Mission Suitability page count will likely cause some lower level detail tasks to be rolled up to summary tasks. Another alternative is to have the electronic copy to be the complete schedule and the Mission Suitability printed copy to be a subset of the complete schedule.

RESPONSE: The government is requesting the electronic copy of the integrated network schedule (in all detail) with a subset of the complete schedule printed in the Mission Suitability Volume.

7. **QUESTION:** Performance Specification requirement 3.1.2 states "900 mJ." This appears to be a typo and should be "900 microjoules". Is this a typo?

RESPONSE: The performance specification requirement 3.1.2 should read "900 microjoules". The ATLAS Laser Performance Specification has been revised to make this change.

8. **QUESTION:** SOW 3.2(2) (a) and (c) and 3.2(3) (b) and (d), Electrical [optical] support equipment to operate laser [ITL] installed in the instrument. Please define the interfaces and operating conditions provided by the instrument to the lasers and ITL so that requirements for the support equipment can be determined.

RESPONSE: The ITL and Laser interfaces to the instrument are provided in the Laser Performance Specification (ICESat-2-ATSYS-SPEC-0099).

9. **QUESTION:** Performance Specification Appendix B, ITL Specification, calls out Requirement 3.15.1b as “Lifetime” and is not applicable to the ITL. 3.15.1b is the internal monitoring requirement and appropriate error messages to alert the user to the cause of anomalies. Lifetime is addressed in 3.16.x. Please correct typo in appendix B, line 3.15.1b to Internal Fail Safe Switch. Is the requirement applicable to the ITL?

RESPONSE: The Performance Specification is being updated to make this correction. The Requirement 3.15.b. is an internal monitoring requirement and applies to the ITL.

10. **QUESTION:** Per NFS 1837.203-70(f), the NFS clause 1852.237-72 Access of Sensitive Information is supposed to be inserted in all solicitations and contracts for Services that may require access to sensitive information belonging to other companies or generated by the Government. This clause is for Service Contracting, and the ICESAT-2 Flight Laser Systems Contract is an R&D Development type contract, not a service contracting type. From the NFS, it reads that this would apply to Advisory and Assistance Services; therefore we recommend deletion of this clause from the RFP. Please confirm if this is an R&D Development type contract.

RESPONSE: The RFP has been revised to delete this clause. This is an R&D Development type acquisition.

11. **QUESTION:** WBS items 2.6 and 5.3 (Reliability) appear to overlap as well as 2.7 and 5.2 (Safety). What is the content difference between WBS element 2 and 5 items for reliability and safety? Is it acceptable to combine 2.6 and 5.3 into one WBS item and similarly for 2.7 and 5.2 for safety?

RESPONSE: The WBS in the SOW is updated to simplify the work break down. The Safety Analysis and Reliability Analysis were removed from Section 2. Reliability and Safety work is captured in WBS 5 only.

12. **QUESTION:** Engineering CDRL 59 Laser Mass Model calls out SOW section 2.2.2.4. SOW Section 2.2.2.4 does not exist. What are the requirements for the Laser Mass Model?

RESPONSE: The SOW Appendix D was updated to reference the Laser Performance Specification (ICESat-2-ATSYS-SPEC-0099) Sections **4.3 and 4.4 for the Laser Mass Model.**

13. **QUESTION:** SOW 5.7.1 notes an “As Built Materials List” to be delivered using the form in the SOW Appendix. There is no form in the appendix. Please supply the form that is identified.

RESPONSE: The SOW is updated clarifying that contractor format is permissible for the “As Built Materials List.”

14. **QUESTION:** The Draft RFP included a Mission Assurance Requirements (MAR) document, ICESat-2-SMA-REQ-0009. This document was not released by GSFC with the Final RFP documents. Will a final version of the MAR be released? Is the 21 Apr 2010 version of the document required for this proposal?

RESPONSE: The MAR requirements are now included in the Government Statement of Work.

15. **QUESTION:** Would the Government consider lowering the threshold for past performance specified in L.18 Past Performance Volume?

RESPONSE: Multiple offerors have expressed concerns over the threshold established for past performance and the Government has decided to lower the threshold from \$7,500,000 to \$2,000,000. Prime Offerors shall furnish information requested in L.18 Past Performance Volume for all of their most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a total cost/fee incurred of at least \$2,000,000.

16. **QUESTION:** Can the Government change the amount of cost/fee for a proposed subcontract to be counted as significant, from the new value of \$4.5M to some fraction (20-25%) of the full contract value?

RESPONSE: The RFP, paragraph L.18 Past Performance Volume has been revised to remove the dollar threshold established to define a significant subcontractor. The following language for defining a significant subcontractor has been added to L.18 Past Performance Volume:

“A proposed significant subcontractor for this procurement is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is critical to the scope of work to develop and deliver flight laser systems. For example, the laser optics development, laser diode development, electronics development, laser amplifier development, or laser oscillator development are considered critical and significant if performed by a subcontractor.”

17. **QUESTION:** An inconsistency appears to have arisen in answers to questions concerning the integrated network schedule file and narrative description required in the RFP (Section L-16 (3)) and the electronic time-phased activity and milestone schedule (Section L-14 (4)).

Please clarify if the time phased activity and milestone schedule and the integrated network schedule are one and the same. If so, is the schedule to be submitted both electronically and as part of the page count? If they are not the same, which one, if either is part of the Technical Proposal page count?

RESPONSE: The government is requesting the electronic copy of the integrated network schedule (in all detail) with a subset of the complete schedule printed in the Mission Suitability Volume. The time phased activity and milestone schedule and the integrated network schedule are one and the same.

18. **QUESTION:** Attachment R's document number is inconsistent with the document number that is referenced in the Attachment B Specification applicable documents list. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: The correct document number for Attachment B, Radiation Environment Description Document is ICESat-2-SYS-REQ-0277. The document number referenced in the ATLAS Laser Performance Specification is incorrect and has been revised.

19. **QUESTION:** Statement of Work Appendix D E-CDRL 59 (laser mass model) references SOW paragraph 2.2.2.4 which does not exist within the released SOW. Please clarify the requirements for this item.

RESPONSE: The SOW Appendix D has been updated to reference the Laser Performance Specification (ICESat-2-ATSYS-SPEC-0099) Sections 4.3 and 4.4 for the Laser Mass Model.

20. **QUESTION:** ICESAT-2 ATSYS SPEC-0099 & ICESAT-2-THM-IFACE-0314

The axis in Figure 2: Laser Envelope with Light Exit Path (dimension in cm) in the ICESat-2 ATSYS-SPEC-0099 is inconsistent with Figure 1: Coordinate Axis listed in ICESat-2-THM-IFACE-0314. Please clarify the correct orientation of the laser.

RESPONSE: The ATLAS Laser Performance Specification ICESat-2 ATSYS SPEC-0099 takes precedence over the Coordinate Axis listed in ICESat-2-THM-IFACE-0314.

21. **QUESTION:** Section B.2 Supplies and/or Services Provided; A: Hardware: 1) The scheduled dates for delivery of the Flight Sensors is not consistent with those in the SOW/Appendix D. Please Clarify. 2) The Table does not include the Integration and Test Model. Please Clarify.

RESPONSE: The Statement of Work/Appendix D and the RFP delivery schedule have been revised and are now consistent. The Integration and Test Laser (ITL) Model and other hardware have been added to Section B.2. The delivery dates have also been revised (ITL – delivery is 23 months after contract award) and (Flight lasers 1-4 the delivery is 24, 27, 30 and 35 months after contract award).

22. **QUESTION:** SOW 3.2 – Lasers item 2) and its corresponding subparts are not stated in deliverables in Appendix D. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: The subparts are deliverables with each flight laser deliverable and are noted in the “Item Form” column (far right) in Appendix D.

23. **QUESTION:** The program SOW calls for the delivery of an Integration and Test Laser and User’s Manual, E-CDRL Item 12. However the B.2 Supplies and Services to be Provided Section does not list the I&T Laser as a deliverable. Is this just an oversight?

RESPONSE: The RFP Section B, B.2 has been revised to include the Integration and Test Laser as a deliverable. The I&T Laser delivery is 23 months after contract award.

24. **QUESTION:** Please define the test equipment (Item Form in Appendix D of SOW) required by E-CDRL’s 55, 56, 57, and 58.

RESPONSE: The test equipment is unique to the laser architecture proposed and is delivered to accommodate final post-shipment testing at NASA GSFC. Please refer to SOW Section 4.1.3, second paragraph.

25. **QUESTION:** SOW E-CDRL 59 calls for a Laser Mass Model per SOW Section 2.2.2.4. Section 2.2.2.4 does not exist. Please clarify this requirement.

RESPONSE: The statement of work, Appendix D has been revised to reference the Laser Performance Specification (ICESat-2-ATSYS-SPEC-0099) Sections 4.3 and 4.4. for the Laser Mass Model.

26. **QUESTION:** RFP section F.3 Period of Performance states that the POP is award through launch (January 2016). Recommend the POP of the contract be extended to include the incentive portion of the contract.

RESPONSE: The period of performance for this procurement is from contract award through launch (January 2016). The performance incentive covers the on-orbit mission month 6 and concludes 36 months later. The incentive period begins after commissioning at launch plus 61 days. Section F, F.3 Period of Performance has been revised to clarify the performance period.

27. **QUESTION:** RFP section F.3 Period of Performance: The Award fee portion covers award through L+60 days (January 2016). The incentive portion starts at L+ 6 months. Shouldn't the incentive evaluation period begin at L+ 61 days?

RESPONSE: Section F, F.3 has been revised to specify the period of performance. See Response to Question #26.

28. **QUESTION:** F.3 Period of Performance: States that the performance incentives cover the on-orbit mission month 6 and concludes 60 months later. This is inconsistent with Clause B.5 Performance Incentive which goes out 36 months. Please clarify.

RESPONSE: Section F, F.3 has been revised to specify the period of performance. See Response to Question #26.

29. **QUESTION:** Clause B.5 Performance Incentive: For Scenario 1, the last sentence states "In this nominal range, the vendor neither earns or loses award fee." Should this read: "In this nominal range, the vendor neither earns or loses the incentive fee"?

RESPONSE: We have reviewed the language for Scenario 1 and the language will remain as written.

30. **QUESTION:** Clause B.5 Performance Incentive: For Scenario 2, the last paragraph says that the FOT (NASA) has decided to continue operating on the first laser, but the vendor shall pay the Government a negative incentive amount which is 16% of the total amount of the earned award fee. This contradicts the last section of B.5 (d) Negative Incentive. The last section of B.5 (d) states that if the WPE falls below the Negative Performance Parameter, but the FOT decides to

continue operations, then the vendor will receive the full Positive Performance Incentive. Please revise scenario 2 to be consistent with the statement in section B.5 (d).

RESPONSE: Clause B.5 (d) has been revised to delete the following paragraph: “If the WPE falls below the Negative Performance Technical Parameter WPE at evaluation, but the NASA Flight Operations Team (FOT) elects to continue operating on the laser, then the vendor receives the full Positive Performance Technical Portion of Incentive Fee Possible Per Period [see section (b)].”

31. **QUESTION:** The last section of B.5(d) refers to the vendor receiving the full Positive Performance Technical Portion of Incentive Fee, but then refers to section (b). Should the reference be to Positive Performance section (c)?

RESPONSE: Paragraph 3 in Section (d) from Clause B.5 has been deleted. See response to Question #30.

32. **QUESTION:** Will FAR 52.204-10 Reporting Executive Compensation and First-Tier Subcontract Awards (JUL 2010) be included in this contract?

RESPONSE: Yes. The RFP has been revised to add clause FAR 52.204-10 to Section I.

33. **QUESTION:** For Attachment S: Transparency and Accountability in Government Contracting – Does this apply only to Contract Award or all Contract Modifications post award as well?

RESPONSE: The Transparency and Accountability in Government Contracting applies to the contract award and all post award contract modifications.